

55
--~~56~~. A method according to claim ~~55~~⁵⁴, further including the step of providing an alarm indication at a predetermined time.--

51
--~~57~~. A method according to claim ~~52~~⁵⁰, further including the step of transferring the value equal to the dosage stored in the memory device to an external data collection device.--

49
--~~58~~. A method according to claim ~~51~~⁴⁸, further including the step of transferring program instructions from an external programming device to the processor.--

REMARKS

By virtue of this amendment, claims 1-58 are pending, claims 11 and 13 have been amended, and claims 30-58 have been added. Examination and allowance of all of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In response to the Office Action dated July 25, 1994, applicants provisionally elect with traverse the species as shown in Figs. 14-16 of the Drawings (i.e., group 2) for purposes of further prosecution of this application. The embodiments of the provisionally elected species, as shown in Figs. 14-16, correspond to pending claims 9-17 and newly added claims 30-58.

Applicants respectfully traverse the election requirement set forth in the Office Action of June 17, 1994 with respect to Figs. 14-16 and 17-18. The Office Action divides the Drawings into five groups, which are as follows:

- 1) The species as shown in Figs. 1-13;
- 2) The species as shown in Figs. 14-16;
- 3) The species as shown in Figs. 17-18;
- 4) The species as shown in Figs. 19-21; and

5) The species as shown in Figs. 22-24(d).

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that "currently, no claim is generic." This statement is respectfully traversed in regards to Figs. 14-18. The applicants have carefully reviewed the Drawings and the claims, and respectfully submit that independent apparatus claim 9, and new independent claim 36 and method claim 51, are generic to the species disclosed in Figs. 14-18. A reading of these claims indicates that each embodiment illustrated in Figs. 14-18 would be encompassed by the elements recited in claims 9, 36 and 51. For example, each embodiment has "a medication injector for injecting a dosage of a medication; a blood characteristic monitor for analyzing a blood sample [and] a processor coupled to the medication injector and the blood characteristic monitor, wherein the processor determines a value equal to the dosage of the medication to be injected by the medication injector, and wherein the processor determines blood characteristics from the blood sample analyzed by the blood characteristic monitor" as recited in claim 9. Moreover, the claims do not recite elements not present in the embodiments illustrated in Figs. 14-18. Thus, claims 9, 36 and 51 should be considered generic for the disclosed embodiments in Figs. 14-18.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the election requirement made in the Office Action dated July 25, 1994 in regards to Figs. 14-18 are respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 13 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. New claims 30-58 have been added by this amendment. No new matter has been added. In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 30-58 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application and the claims are in condition for allowance. Examination of the application, as amended, is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (310) 553-5050 should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
SPENSLEY HORN JUBAS & LUBITZ

Date: August 25, 1994

By: 
Paul H. Kovelman
Registration No. 35,228

1880 Century Park East
Fifth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 553-5050